**Minutes of Livestock CRP PMC-3**

**6-7 September 2017**

**Participants:**

* Michael Peters, Tropical Forages Program Leader, CIAT
* Marlis Lindecke, Senior Programme Manager, GIZ
* Paul-Theodor Scheutz, Programme Manager, GIZ
* Barbara Rischkowsky, Director, Sustainable Intensification and Resilient Production Systems Program, ICARDA
* Helen Altshul, Performance and Partnerships Manager, CRP Livestock, ILRI
* Misja Brandenburg, Director, Corporate Services, ILRI
* Nicoline de Haan, Senior Gender Scientist, ILRI
* Thomas Randolph, Director, CRP Livestock, ILRI
* Jimmy Smith, Director General, ILRI
* Iain Wright, Deputy Director General, Integrated Sciences, ILRI
* Ulf Magnusson, Theme Leader, Urban and Peri-urban Farming, SLU Global, SLU

1. **Welcome – Jimmy Smith**

The ILRI DG welcomed the PMC members to ILRI Nairobi. He noted some of the discussions taking place at CGIAR system level and the pending results of the review of the two CRP Livestock Flagships. The PMC will be the main governance organ for this new CRP and ILRI looks forward to working with the PMC members to implement a strong and convincing CRP Livestock research program. The need for the CRP to operate effectively and meet deadlines was stressed, especially in terms of improving the timeliness and quality of reporting.

1. **Proposed Agenda and Approval of PMC-2 Minutes – Tom Randolph** [Presentation 1]

The PMC-2 minutes were not finalized due to changes in the CRP management staff, but will be shared shortly. There were no urgent issues to be carried forward to this meeting. The agenda for the PMC-3 meeting was adopted.

1. **Director’s update – Tom Randolph** [Presentation 1]

The Director’s report summarized recent developments at system level, the science leaders meeting (June 2017), and the current funding situation.

1. **Independent Steering Committee Processes – Tom Randolph** [Presentation 1]

The ISC will have an important advisory role supporting the PMC with high-level science inputs and contributing to management decisions. Initially there will be 5 members, 2 women and 3 men, with the potential to increase to 6 members in future if needed to fill any technical gaps. The list of candidates was discussed. The ILRI DG stressed that the ISC will be encouraged to challenge the CRP and the PMC should take these interventions seriously to improve the program outputs and impact.

1. **PMC Role in Reviewing the 2018 POWBs – Tom Randolph** [Issue Brief 3-2, Presentation 1]

The intention is for the PMC to play a stronger role than in the previous CRP in reviewing Flagship work plans and budgets and ensuring scientific coherence, relevance and fit with the CRP proposal (including Theories of Change and key research lines and outputs). Another objective is to support the Flagship Leaders in taking more responsibility in leadership roles beyond program coordination. General criteria for the review were agreed, with the expectation that clear feedback be provided.

1. **2018 POWB Reviews – CRP Livestock Flagships**

Information provided in the presentations is not repeated here; the presentations are available on the Livestock CRP wiki. Only points raised by the participants are noted.

* 1. **Livestock and the Environment – Polly Ericksen** [Presentation 2]

Points raised:

* Youth strategy for the CRP is currently focused on employment opportunities. Need to consider how youth involvement in environmental management is considered and incorporated.
* Think about how to handle those areas that will not be funded from W1/W2 yet are important e.g. water and biodiversity. Possible links with other CRPs e.g. WLE.
* Country differences with other Flagships should be addressed by agreement on priority countries for the CRP.
  1. **Livestock Health – Ulf Magnusson** [Presentation 3]

Points raised:

* Vish Nene’s concern was noted about how to provide evidence of activities under the diagnostics/vaccines cluster when papers are not published in international journals. This should not be a big problem because other types of outputs e.g. reports, blog posts are also counted as evidence.
* The issue was raised of how to share information about activities which fail, to help others to avoid making the same mistakes – there should be journals who are willing to publish this type of information.
* Under the 60% funding scenario, several activities will not be done as originally planned in 2018. Some are expected to be covered by LLAFS. If that Flagship is not funded, then the funds will revert to Livestock Health which will have to ensure that key activities are re-included in the work plan for 2018.
  1. **Feed and Forages – Michael Peters** [Presentation 4]

Points raised:

* Need to champion work on how this Flagship can develop release criteria for new varieties of fodder and links with crop-based CRPs for livestock feed options.
* Pipeline looks good but confirmed funding for 2018 is currently low.
* Figures of how many people the Flagship will impact look high and may need to be revised in the light of funding availability.
  1. **Animal Genetics – Olivier Hanotte** [Presentation 5]

Points raised:

* In future need to ensure that the presentation represents the entire Flagship and not just ILRI activities and budget.
* There will be some changes in 2018 W1/W2 funding proportions to clusters based on the adjustments required to achieve ToC outputs and outcomes, not just on the amount of money available.
* On oestrus synchronization there is probably a role for private sector companies. Business skills are not available within the Flagship, to initiate partnerships with private sector. However, Christoph Weber is doing some work for the CRP on agribusiness and would be a good resource person.
* Information on the end results for the Flagship is currently missing.
* Need to acknowledge that evidence for the role of genetics in livestock development is contentious.
* Would be good to have more discussion on the ToC. It appears over-simplified and some of the links tenuous.
* Underspending is not a good thing in terms of discussion with CGIAR and donors on CRP funding requirements. Also need to be careful in the case of bilateral grants displacing W1/W2 funds to demonstrate that there will still be important outputs from these funds and we are not just using them to co-finance admin/staff costs.
  1. **Livestock Livelihoods and Agrifood Systems – Steve Staal** [Presentation 6]

Points raised:

* This Flagship was not funded in 2017 so the team has not had the opportunity to meet face-to-face to discuss the 2018 plans.
* Traffic light report – currently all funding is bilateral so the Flagship has no control/flexibility.
* Cluster 3 links to A4NH. Paula, nutritionist based in London, works on both CRPs.
* Cluster 4 wants to integrate outputs/technologies from other Flagships and look at them through a research lens (not just development).
* Need to plan meetings with other Flagships (including all partners) to discuss more on gender, impact assessment, policy modelling, institutional arrangements. Assuming the Flagship is approved for 2018, W1/W2 funding could help to cover staff time to engage more on these issues.
* How to handle the youth aspect in the Flagship activities: together with gender or elsewhere? The youth strategy is still in development.

1. **POWB 2018 Reviews – Cross-cutting issues**
   1. **Open Access – Jane Poole**

The SIF support for this work is now being merged with ILRI work on the cross-cutting Big Data Platform, which was only approved in June 2017. A revised work plan is being developed with activities continuing into 2018. A review is currently taking place to agree on issues of when, how and what to publish as open access data given the requirements for confidentiality and the need to protect intellectual property.

* 1. **Gender (and Social Equity) – Nicoline de Haan** [Presentation 7]

Points raised:

* Gender is everywhere and we should not discount its importance in relation to lab-based work e.g. vaccines.
* Terminology needs to change such that gender strategies are developed with the Flagships (not for them).
* Gender is not just restricted to women and this needs to be clear in terms of presentation.
* The presentation needs to cite data sources (FAO SOFA 2011 and USAID Karamoja).
* In Feeds and Forages there are gender implications for labour requirements.
* In Animal Health, need to capture women’s role in terms of knowledge and action.
* Flagships need to think about how to involve gender staff more in their communications/meetings/documents.
  1. **Capacity Development – Iddo Dror** [Presentation 8]

Points raised:

* Note that CLEANED is not a CIAT tool: it was a product of the CRP Livestock and Fish.
* Flagships need guidance on how to handle reporting on CapDev activities. Work with MSc/PhD students and technical trainings fit more within the normal Flagship activity reporting. SMO is working on reporting indicators.
* In terms of priorities for investment it is difficult for the ILRI CapDev unit to support partners if they don’t know what activities are being implemented during the year. Flagships also don’t understand the support that is available.
* Need to think about how to confirm quality of training conducted by Flagships. With many small activities, cost of evaluation is proportionately higher. Feeds and Forages Flagship has some strategic money for evaluation.
* Some capacity development products are coming out of Flagships e.g. FEAST, SOFT.
* When planning assessments, the entry point is countries, but obviously also need input from Flagships.
  1. **M&E – Helen Altshul** [Presentation 9]

Points raised:

* Presentation focused on the bigger picture and future priorities for the CRP.
* Closing the yield gap is an important sub-IDO for the Animal Health Flagship. However, the presumed link between yield and livelihoods was an issue for donors in earlier research proposals.
* Each Flagship should identify critical assumptions and develop a hypothesis for testing them. There could be a role for MSc students attached to Flagships to carry out some of the research.
* In terms of process, MARLO, ToC and data management were previously being done mainly through Jane Poole. Need to be clear about roles. ToC is more Helen, data management is more Jane; for MARLO, both are involved.

1. **Wrap Up on POWBs**

Review focus ended up being mainly on presentation format and not on the content. The PMC will need to be continually reflective and critical. Points raised:

* Presentations are losing the storyline and the passion for the work. Should present Gantt charts on the key research lines, include data on key bilateral donors, explain reductions in activities occasioned by reduced funding.
* Slides presented were a bit crowded. We need to have a presentation that is condensed, clear and compelling.
* Quality of leadership in terms of representing the entire Flagship was variable.
* Still some way to go on integration across Flagships, institutional arrangements and joint activities.
* Traffic light reporting worked quite well.
* It is good to show Flagship fund allocation per partner but this doesn’t need to go down to the Cluster level.
* Need to pull together successes/failures/lessons from each Flagship into an overall picture for the CRP Livestock.
* The spirit of the engagement with the ISC is seeking advice and scientific input. Presentations should include more science content and raise questions/issues as well as presenting polished stories.
* Need to clarify expectations from the ISC and colleagues in terms of preparation before the meeting e.g. reading each other’s SIPs. All Flagship Leaders should attend each other’s presentations.
* Face-to-face meetings should allocate enough time to discussing science. Science days might be an idea – separating it out from administration.
* To manage timelines so that Flagship Leaders who are only part-time on the CRP can prepare ahead of schedule:
  + Where there is a deadline, indicate this in bold in the subject line of emails.
  + Put in place some alarms/reminders before the deadlines and put a shared calendar on the Wiki.
* Visibility for cross-cutting themes is important within the CRP. Tell a story and determine end points if possible.
* For the Theory of Change, need to discuss logic and test key assumptions that affect the likelihood of research clusters contributing to the anticipated outputs and outcomes.
* Communication strategy should be developed at the overall CRP level, rather than for individual Flagships.

Actions:

* PMU to develop:
  + a glossary of terms for the CRP including research/product lines, milestones, etc.
  + Presentation template, drawing from the best examples used during the PMC sessions.

1. **Strategy for Priority Countries** [Issue Brief 3-3, Presentation 1]

Reduced funding to the CRP and especially the LLAFS flagship is hampering the ability of the CRP to implement its priority country strategy. The risk of having systemic underinvestment in the priority countries repeats the frustrating experience of the Livestock & Fish CRP in achieving sufficient critical mass and the full range of results expected at priority country level. The proposal is to repeat an evidence-based process for selecting a reduced number of priority countries and ensure a minimum level of investment and involvement of the flagships.

* There is still discussion about how the CRPs should work together, even though site integration is fizzling out and focus now is on strengthening working together where it is already happening e.g. in Ethiopia.
* Focusing on 4 priority countries would redefine their role from being the primary delivery mechanism for CRP results to instead allowing the CRP to have demonstration pilots of how Flagships working together can achieve outcomes and impacts and show the added value of integration supported by W1/2 funding. It will also provide sites where we can do more detailed M&E to demonstrate impact.
* Flagships will also have other priority countries specifically related to their ToC and research lines to achieve their overall targets, but will continue to have responsibility to show how they are achieving their outputs and outcomes in the priority countries.
* This works well for most research areas, but it may be more difficult in some of the newer areas e.g. under the Environment Flagship, where you don’t necessarily need all the research themes to achieve an impact.
* Portfolio should cover key value chains (e.g. dairy, pigs, small ruminants, poultry) plus livelihood systems.
* Hypothesis from L&F: The less developed the value chain, the more impact an integrated approach can achieve.

Way forward:

* + End October 2017 - Task force to define different livestock-based livelihood systems and propose which need to be covered by the CRP – Steve Staal, Nicoline, Isabelle, Barbara, Stephan.
  + November 2017 - PMU to develop list of selection criteria (based on original business case format from CRP 1) and apply to countries, then circulate list to PMC and Flagship Leaders.
  + December 2017 - Decision in next face to face PMC and presentation to ISC.
  + Detailed business cases will be developed afterward for only the 4 priority countries.

1. **Managing the Bilateral Project Portfolio** [Issue Brief 3-4, Presentation 1]

With the increased reliance on bilateral projects aligned to the CRP as the means for achieving the CRP outputs and outcomes, it is important to have the needed information to allow flagship leaders to manage their W1/2 investments to best leverage their bilateral project portfolio. Principles were therefore proposed and discussed for improving the CRP’s ability to justify the alignment of bilateral projects and how their role in the CRP is managed. Points of discussion:

* Use of scarce W1/W2 funding to leverage bilateral funding must be justified strongly. When a bilateral project is being prepared, a one-page project brief should be shared with the Flagship Leader and PMC for input, especially if there is an expectation of W1/2 co-financing.
* Co-financing should be discussed with the CRP Director and PMC during proposal development and agreed by the ISC.
* Synergies are being missed because of lack of information sharing. Flagship meetings should discuss one-pagers.
* “Bonus” deliverables from new projects coming on-stream during the year should be reported but does not require changing the POWB.
* From the Center perspective, we need to report bilaterals through the CRP because that’s our only mechanism to reach the System Council, but for individual PIs there is no incentive if they are not getting co-financing.
* Need to sort out the master list of bilaterals – currently there are multiple versions although Flagship admin staff are meant to be updating the file on the wiki.

Actions:

* PMU to develop a template (based on MARLO requirements) for basic project information.

1. **Strategic Investment Fund Update** [Presentation 1]

A short update on the status of the agreed SIF items was presented. Discussion points:

* Impact assessment will be the main continuing activity from the SIF in future years. We are approaching KIT to provide independent involvement in design. CIAT will be providing advice on fodder and seed assessment techniques.
* Wouter is looking at how the youth angle can feed into flagship priorities – technology and product development, strategic research, youth employment. GIZ has done labour analyses in some countries that might be helpful. The Youth Strategy will be ready in draft form in time for discussion at ISC. There may be a call for proposals before then.
* Funds from the SIF country collaboration line are supporting “business smart” assessments (Christoph Weber).
* Consider supporting Ethiopia country collaboration efforts. A meeting with NARS there is scheduled for November.
* Prioritization tool development is looking at how to make better use of data for decision making. This year there will be a review of the existing framework tool and from January work on the next steps (ILRI and ICARDA). Is intended to strengthen the capacity of the CRP to do periodic ex-ante assessment of proposed research investments.
* CRP financial management system – delayed because of ILRI Board view that it should be integrated into OCS.
* Competitive research calls – likely to focus on M&E requirements at country level, call pending.

1. **Carry-over Guidelines**

It is generally expected that some funds may be carried over from one budget year to the next as required by normal business operations. It is proposed to provide guidelines based on agreed principles and understanding of what is considered reasonable carry-over. Discussion points:

* Discourage over-spending in any one year and under-spending to cushion against future reductions, since this gives the impression that the CRP doesn’t need the money and causes issues with overhead costs recovery.
* There appears to be consensus from the System Office to allow some flexibility in terms of carry over during Phase 2 of the CRP portfolio. Difficulty is not knowing the exact budget for future years.
* **Decision**: Agreement = Option B, to allow 10% underspend/carry-over without needing to give reasons. Larger amounts will require justification and approval.

1. **Other issues**

* Next virtual PMC is likely to be 1st or 2nd November, or soon after the System Council meeting.
* Next face to face PMC will be between 11th-15th December, venue TBC depending on ISC meeting.
* There were some issues with SLU, now mostly resolved, but in the face to face meeting we can discuss them.
* Tom to propose a rationale to PMC for including KIT as a partner in the CRP.

1. **Partnerships – GIZ**

GIZ is a full partner of the Livestock CRP, but its role and modalities for how it will contribute have yet to worked out. PMC took advantage of the presence of Marlis Lindecke, Senior Programme Manager at GIZ, to discuss how we could shape the partnership. Discussion points:

* Livestock does not currently play a major role in BMZ.
* Two GIZ green innovation centers (Kisumu, Kenya and Zambia) work on dairy. The rest work mainly on crops.
* GIZ can play a role in linking the Livestock CRP’s research-for-development model to development partners in priority countries. We could look at employing a joint person to help develop those mechanisms.
* Reflection will be needed to determine the impacts of intensive involvement of GIZ in the CRP and whether it provides “value for money”. Tom to circulate something on this by end October 2017.
* It is appropriate for GIZ to remain in the PMC to help us think about the sphere of influence of the CRP.
* For the CIM work on Feeds and Forages, there might be a specific need for expertise on development and business processes. GIZ also has 7 CIM experts in other Centers. Consider developing a concept note on this to mobilize resources.
* CIAT sees a specific opportunity to submit a joint proposal to International Climate Initiative (ICI) with GIZ for Colombia on Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Actions (NAMA). Call will be €15-20m over 6-8 years. Will discuss with Polly because it fits with Environment as well as Feeds and Forage Flagship.